

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed April 22, 2003. In the office action the Examiner:

- objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4); and
- rejected claims 1-8, 10-13 and 19-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 1, for lack of enablement.

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-8, 10-13 and 19-28.

I. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters 13, 16, 18, and 15 have all been used to designate “.” It is unclear on exactly what grounds the Examiner bases his rejection. For the sake of clarity, however, reference character 13 has been moved in Figure 2 to more clearly indicate the location of first toggle joint 13, which in the illustrative embodiment shown, is in the vicinity of swivel pin 25. Also for the sake of clarity, reference character 16 has been moved in Figure 2 to more clearly indicate the location of second toggle joint 16, which in the illustrative embodiment shown, is in the vicinity of swivel pin 27. Reference character 15 points to the “second joint” of the first toggle joint 13 which, as described in the specification at pages 5, lines 2-3, may comprise “the part of the activation bar that is between the swivel pins 25 and 21.” Similarly, reference character 18 points to the “second joint” of the second toggle joint 16 which, as described in the specification at page 5, lines 7-8, may comprise “the part of the activation bar that is between the swivel pins 27 and 21.”

The Examiner also objected to the drawings because reference characters 15, 18 and 21 “point dotted lines; however, in the specifications states these elements show real parts and not lines.” As discussed above, reference character 15 points to the “second joint” of first toggle joint 13 which may comprise “the part of the activation bar that is between the swivel pins 25 and 21.” Likewise, reference character 18 points to the “second joint” of second toggle joint 16 which may comprise “the part of the activation bar that is between the swivel pins 27 and 21.” Accordingly, both of reference characters 15 and 18 point to “real parts.” Also, reference character 21 clearly points to a swivel pin and not a line.


II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1, for lack of enablement. The Examiner indicated that it was confusing because “first toggle joint 13” and “second joint 15” pointed to the same element, and because “second toggle joint 16” and “second joint 18” pointed to the same element. Figure 2 has now been amended to more clearly indicate the location of “first toggle joint 13” as the general location of the connection between “first joint 15” and “second joint 16,” which in the illustrative embodiment shown, is in the vicinity of swivel pin 21. Figure 2 has also been amended to more clearly indicate the location of “second toggle joint 16” as the general location of the connection between “first joint 17” and “second joint 18,” which in the illustrative embodiment shown, is in the vicinity of swivel pin 25. As disclosed in the specification at page 5, lines 2-3, “[t]he part of the activation bar that is between the swivel pins 25 and 21 forms the second joint 15 of the first toggle joint 13.” The specification states further at page 5, lines 7-8 that “[t]he part of the activation bar that is between the swivel pins 27 and 21 forms the second joint 18 of the second toggle 16.” First toggle joint 13 may include both the first joint 14 and the second joint 15, and second toggle joint 16 may include both the first joint 17 and the second joint 18. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-13 and 19-28 is overcome by the amendment to the Figures 1 and 2.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 22, 2003


Steven J. Schwarz (Reg. No. 47,070)
For Victor N. Balancia (Reg. No. 31,231)
PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 496-4400